Sri Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—I am not aware of it.

Sri R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet).—At Bellary as the hon. Minister says, there are two hospitals and they are about 3 miles apart. Even taking those two hospitals into consideration you will get only 318 beds and it falls short of 600 beds. That is one of the most difficult situation that has arisen there. Will the Minister state that he will make provision for 600 beds as quickly as possible? Please give specific time when you will be able to supply 600 beds.

Sri Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—It is not possible to state that 600 beds required will be supplied within one year. I think within two or three years it may be possible to increase the bed strength to 600.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರುದುರ್ಗ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿದಿವಸವೂ ಆಡ್ಮಿಟ್ ಆಗತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಪೇಷೆಂಟ್ಸ್ 5ಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಬೆಡ್ ಸ್ಟ್ರೆಂಗ್ತ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಪೇಷೆಂಟ್‌ಗಳು ಬರುವ ಸಂಭವ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು ಹೇಗೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

Sri Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—I am not aware of such a thing.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—What may be the cost involved in creating 600 bed strength? If it comes within two or three lakhs, is it not possible that we can meet the demands of the boys?

Sri Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—For the civil work I think it costs Rs. 3,000 per bed non-recurring and to maintain it, it comes to Rs. 800 per year per bed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have an announcement to make. In view of the statement made by the Hon. Minister for Health and clarifications thereon I withhold my consent to all the adjournment motion notices given in respect of the Medical College, Bellary.

Raising a debate on the Nomination to the Agricultural Produce Market Committee.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, have I your permission to move the subject for which I have given notice under rule 312 about the proposal or contemplation of the Government to nominate the Regulated Market Committees in the State abolishing all the existing committees?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member has given notice and he can raise it.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, I and other 30 hon. Members gave notice under Rule 312 of the Rules of Procedure, because we learnt the Government contemplate to abolish all the existing Regulated Market Committees in the State and pack them with nominated members. I believe that the High Court has given them direction in one of the writ Petitions decided on 3rd February 1969. There were a bunch of writ petitions, in all 108 in number. They were heard cumulatively in

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

one hearing by the High Court and many questions were decided there. Among them, one of sections that was impugned was Section 10 of the Act. Section 10 was not directly impugned. Section 10 refers to the new Market Committees that will have to come into force after the Act is introduced. As we all know, this Regulated Market Act was passed in the year 1966.

†SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—(Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs).— There are a few items of formal business on the agenda which have held up some of us here. They are : Laying of papers on the Table and Call Attention Notices. By the trend of the speech of Sri H. Siddaveerappa, I feel that he is anxious to raise a descussion which will take some time. Therefore, I request that formal business may be given precedence over the subject on hand.

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri Siddaveerappa may please be very brief.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Section 10 of the new Act speaks of the Constitution of the first Market Committee. The Act says when this Act comes into force, the first Market Committee will have to be nominated by the Government. The Advocate General stated that so for as nomination under Section 10 is concerned, it refers to the new committees that will have to be formed after the Act comes into force and not with regard to the old committees that are in existence. Under Section 154 (1), all the old committees are allowed to continue in the State of Mysore. There are some committees which are functioning for the last seven to eight years. Now under cover of the High Court decision, if the Government are going to abolish all the existing committees and nominate and practically pack them with their nominees according to their desire, it is nothing but murdering of democracy and democratic process by one stroke of the pen. My apprehension is they may take all the Regulated Market Committees under their control, That is way, even the Advocate General has stated that so far as this nomination is concerned, it refers only to the new market committees that will come to be constituted. The Advocate-General, in answer to the postulate which Mr. Srinivas placed before the High Court, had contended that the provisions of Section 10 are applicable only to new Market Committees and not to the old market committees which were in existence under the provisions of the repealed Act. In other words, a new Market comes into force, then the first committee will have to be nominated, is the argument advanced by the Advocate-General. Of course, the High Court has not accepted his argument. I am glad that my hon. friend Sri K. Puttaswamy, who was the author and architect of this Act, is also here. They all know that the new Act contemplates nominations to the market committee constituted for the first time. When that is so, where is the need for the Government to get names and keep them ready for nomination to all the committees ? My information is that as soon as the present session of the Assembly is over,

Government want to announce nominations by abolishing all the market committees that are already in existence by one stroke of the pen ; and pack them with their own nominees. That is the authentic or the most reliable information I have. Unfortunately the Minister for Co-Operation is not here. But I am glad that the Hon. Deputy Minister for Co-operation, who holds more progressive views, is here. My only request to the Government is that they should not proceed further with this step, which would be a retrograde step. I want a positive assurance from the Government that if necessary, they may bring an amendment to Section 10. In the meanwhile, they may notify that there will be no nominations to the committees that are already in existence in all parts of the State. As a matter of fact, the Hige Court has stated that the new Act shall have to give prominence to the grower so that he may have predominant voice with regard to the marketing of his produce. I request the Hon. Deputy Minister to examine this aspect. I have gone through the entire High Court decision. I have no time to refer to it now, because some members on the Treasury Benches are eager to go.

The Government have gone a step further. They have asked the Deputy Commissioners to get ready with the elections. In some cases, lists are ready and some are under preparation. I am requesting them not to do this and try to create trouble for the growers.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I am sorry to state that although I have given notice 20 days back for raising certain discussion, discrimination has been made by the Chair by not allowing it so far.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. members making a protest against the Chair. It is a most unfair and uncharitable statement.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Discrimination is there on the floor of this House. I have got a right to protest. If you want I will prove.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The discrimination attributed to the Chiar is absolutely baseless.

The matter was delayed on account of the fact, that the Hon. Minister for Co-operation could not be present here on account of ill-health.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I strongly protest against the attitude of the Speaker. We expect politeness and courtesy from you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I was explaining that the Hon. Minister for Co-operation was not present here. I have received a letter from him in which he says that he is unable to come for another week due to ill health. At the fag end, I wanted all these matters to be brought up and I requested the Deputy Minister to get ready. Having done this, it passes my understanding how the hon. Member Sri Nagappa can say that I have not attended to his notice. That is a most uncharitable view that he has taken.

† Sri B. L. GOWDA (Deputy Minister for Co-operation).—Sir, with reference to the point raised by the hon. Member Sri H. Siddaveerappa and others under Rule 312 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, I beg to make the following statement :

The Hon'ble High Court of Mysore, while pronouncing judgment on a batch of Writ Petitions challenging the validity of the provisions of the Mysore Agricultural Produce Marketing (Regulation) Act, 1966, have held that the election of a Market Committee under Section 11 of the Act must necessarily be preceded by the composition of a nominated Market Committee under Section 10 of the Act, and that it is only by that process that an old Market Committee under a repealed enactment which continues to function under the proviso (c) to Section 154(1) can vacate office.

In wiew of the finding by the Hon'ble High Court, it would appear that the State Government has to take appropriate steps under Section 10 of the Act to constitute the first Market Committees to replace the existing Market Commttees constituted under the repealed enactments. The State Government received the text of the Judgment delivered by the High Court of Mysore on the 15th March 1969. The matter is under the active consideration of Government with reference to the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court. I would like to assure the House at this stage that all aspects of the matter would be taken into account by Government before any final decision is taken in the matter.

I may add that Government do not have the slightest wish to exercise any undue control over the costitution and fuctioning of the Market Committees, but are anxious only to do what is just and proper in the circumstances arising out of the High Court Judgment.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I wanted to know whether the Government would think of amending particularly section 10 of the Act and see that the element of nomination is not introduced in places where the markets are alrady in existence for over hundred years.

Sri B. L. GOWDA.—I have already said that it is under the active consideration of the Government The High Court judgment has just been received and we are considering it.

Sri B. L. NARAYANASWAMY (Srinivasapur).—Can it be taken that nominations will not be made as apprehended by the hon. member Sri Siddaveerappa.

Sri B. L. GOWDA.—I have abundantly made it clear that the matter is under the active conisderation of the Government. How can the hon. member assume like that ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The Hon'ble Deputy Minister said that 'they are considering'. Does "considering" mean considering about domination or the wishes of the people or whether the element of nomination should not be introduced in the old markets that are already in existence. What is it that is under the consideration of the Government ?

I have already stated that the view of the Government has been made clear by the arguments of the Learned Advocate-General who has said that it is not necessary to nominate in cases where there are already markets. Is that not the view of the Government.

Sri B. L. GOWDA.—I have already stated that the matter is under the active consideration of the Government with reference to the judgement of the Hon'ble High Court. I have also stated that all aspects of the matter would be taken into account by the Government before a final decision is taken.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ (ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ).—ಇದೇ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಪ್ರಾಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟಿಂಗ್ ಕೋಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ನಾಮಕರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಪ್ರಸಕ್ತ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾಮಕರಣಮಾಡಲು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಯಾರನ್ನೂ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ನೀಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ?

Sri B. L. GOWDA.—I stick to what I have already stated.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—With due respect to the Hon'ble Deputy Minister, if the Government want to nominate, let them say so in so many words.

Sri B. L. GOWDA.—I have said that we have just received the High Court judgement. We are examining it. I may assure the hon. member that we will take all aspects into consideration before a final decision is taken.

Sri S. SHIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—What the hon. member Sri Siddaveerappa says is that the Advocate-General has pointed out in the course of his arguments that the Government should not think of meddling with these societies which are already working, and that this should apply only to the new societies. Are you considering on those lines?

Sri B. L. GOWDA.—We will consider all that is contained in the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court.

Call Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance.

re: **Clashes between two groups in Chamarajanagar Taluk**

Sri S. PUTTASWAMY (Chamarajanagar).—Sir, I call the attention of the Hon'ble Chief Minister to the clash between two rival groups in Ramasamudra Town and Bagali Village in Chamarajanagar Taluk.

Sri MANIKRAO PATIL (Deputy Minister for Home).—Sir as regards the incident at Ramasamudra, Chamarajanagar Taluk, it is reported that on 20th March 1969, at about 5 P.M. members of the Lingayet community took out a procession of deities in connection with Ugadi festival, and that, during the previous years, this festival was being celebrated in the village jointly by members of Lingayat and Harijan